

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is clearly motivated by the owner's political agenda. This wouldn't be a problem if every market served by Sinclair was also served by a station that gave equal time to the opposing point of view. Unfortunately, due to media consolidation, Sinclair-owned stations are often the only source of news in a given marketplace.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, they also control the point of view -- so, people get what is good for the broadcaster's bottom line and less of what's good for democracy.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.